

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: K. TAMURA et al.

Serial No.: 10/769,805

Filed: February 3, 2004

For: STORAGE SYSTEM AND STORAGE CONTROLLER

Group: 2186

Examiner: H. B. Patel

RESPONSE

MS Issue Fee

Commissioner for Patents July 11, 2008
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The following is in response to the objections to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) as set forth in paragraph 5 of the April 24, 2008 Notice of Allowance. Particularly, the Examiner alleges that the limitation that the first controller “recognizes a memory device as a same memory device if a plurality of paths from said first LUN to a plurality of said second logical units are connected to said same memory device” is not illustrated in the drawings. Applicants submit that these features are in fact illustrated by the drawings thereby rendering moot this objection.

Specifically, the above described features are illustrated in Figs. 1 and 9 of the present application and are discussed in the corresponding passages of the present application.

In Fig. 1 there is a large arrow identified as “recognized as internal device” between the memory device 42 of the second storage controller 40

and the memory device 32 of the first storage controller 20. As discussed in the paragraph bridging pages 16 and 17 of the present application the “recognized as internal device” large arrow is intended to illustrate that the memory device 42 existing in the external storage 40 is recognized as the same memory device as memory device 32 with respect to the host system 10.

In Fig. 9 the steps performed by the first controller to verify the alternating path structure between the memory device 42 of the second storage controller 40 and the memory device 32 of the first storage controller are illustrated in the form of a flow chart. The alternating path structure is illustrated in Fig. 3 of the present application. The flowchart in Fig. 9 includes a step S46 wherein it is judged (recognized) that each path is connected to the same external volume and as such verifies that the memory device 42 is the same as memory device 32. Accordingly, the first storage controller recognizes that memory device 42 is the same as memory device 32.

Therefore, it is quite clear that the limitation that the first storage controller “recognizes a memory device as a same memory device if a plurality of paths from the first LUN to a plurality of the second logical units are connected to the memory device” is clearly illustrated in Figs. 1 and 9 in a manner so as to satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR §1.83(a). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) is respectfully requested.

It should be noted that the above described issues were discussed with the Examiner and the Examiner indicated that it seems the above described limitation is illustrated in the drawings.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (1309.43490X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

/Carl I. Brundidge/
Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120